UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/552,402 07/12/2006		Michael Weilkes	10191/4460	9413
26646 KENYON & K	7590 03/29/201 ¹ ENYON LLP	EXAMINER		
ONE BROADV	VAY	MUSTAFA, IMRAN K		
NEW YORK, N	N1 10004		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		3663		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/29/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/552,402	WEILKES ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	

	IMRAN MUSTAFA	3663					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ess				
THE REPLY FILED <u>04 March 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ').	g date of the final rejectio FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	n. .ED WITHIN TWO				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply original controls.	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ite extension fee e action; or (2) as				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	201100				
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in betappeal; and/or	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);					
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	·	•	_				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>NONE</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>NONE</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>14-33</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>NONE</u> . AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		l be entered and an ex	planation of				
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ıl and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a				
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation <u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u> 	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:				
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/JACK KEITH/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3663							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Winner in view of Watanabe clearly disclose the claimed invention. On page 3 of the applicant's response applicants argue that none of the Japanese publications concern predicting a triggering instant. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's arguments. Watanabe clearly teaches this limitation(Column 3 lines 1-25 "improving the resolution of a distance by shortening a modulation cycle (time) so as to decrease a normalized value of a quotient of a distance by a beat frequency. Japanese Unexamined Patent Publication No. 8-189965 (Honda Motor Co., Ltd.) has disclosed a technique for improving the resolution of a distance, wherein when a target is running at a high speed, a modulation cycle (time) is extended in order to widen a range of sensed distances; and when a target is running at a short distance, the modulation cycle (time) is shortened in order to confine the range of sensed distances to short distances.") Thus it is clear here that Watanabe teaches of adjusting the cycle time. Winner clearly discloses of predicting a triggering instant(See at least Abstract "sensor detection range are detected and measured variable are determined for each object. The detected objects are assigned to various object classes on the basis of the determined, associated measured variables, and the movement trajectories of the objects are predicted on the basis of the assignment of the detected objects to the particular class.a collision risk and injury risk are determined from these predicted movement trajectories of the objects"). Thus it is clear that Winner in view of Watanabe disclose the claimed invention..